

pleaded with us not to allow what happened last year to happen this year. He was referring to delaying passing the supplemental because it causes all kinds of problems.

A few weeks ago, he testified again, and he was passionate about this. It is his soldiers, predominantly, Army soldiers in Iraq. He pleaded with us not to delay this supplemental. He said you have to take money from all kinds of accounts, and time and effort the leadership in the Department of Defense needs to be spending helping the soldiers being successful has to be redirected to bringing money together in ways that are not easy to fund the effort. He described it as trying to walk through a marsh waste deep in water—those were his words—in the muck.

We are creating a political muck that makes it very difficult and adds additional burdens to our Defense Department when they have so many important things to do. We should not do that.

I thank the Senator for his eloquent remarks and his leadership on the Armed Services Committee and for his commitment to our soldiers and commitment to the United States of America and the good foreign policy we have had, we seek to accomplish.

Our foreign policy is a foreign policy designed to improve the Middle East. It is designed to improve the lives of the people in Iraq. It is not an imperialistic attempt to gain wealth or power at their expense. We want them to be successful. In the end, it will be successful for us. It will make us more safe. It will make the world more safe and can begin the end of some of the radicalism we are seeing.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for the time remaining under morning business, and I further ask consent that after my time expires, the Senator from Missouri, Mr. BOND, be recognized for a period of 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, let me take this opportunity to extend my deep appreciation to my good friend, Senator REID, for his very genuine persistence in pursuing this Intelligence authorization bill. He has

worked hard, both as minority leader and as majority leader, to try to make this happen.

I suspect Senator BOND and I will have some fairly strong words to say in agreement about this because I think both of us are very dismayed that despite the very considerable efforts of Vice Chairman BOND and myself—we operate very closely together—to get agreement on this bill, there is still an objection to its consideration, as I understand.

It is almost inconceivable to me we are forced to come to this point of cloture and motions to proceed and all kinds of things on a national security bill. I do not understand that, where that comes from, why the motivation, how that happens.

In any event, we are talking about the authorization bill of the Intelligence Committee for 2007; and this is already the period for the 2008 authorization bill. It is inexcusable. From 1978 through 2004—that is a long time, 1978 to 2004—every year, there was an authorization bill, like every year there is a military authorization, Armed Services authorization bill. It happens in all major committees. The Senate had an unbroken 27-year record of having authorization bills every single year. This year and the last year—and I think the preceding year—we did not.

It is very frustrating to the Senator from Missouri and myself. This should be considered, and is considered, must-pass legislation. It is in the national interest. We are in the middle of a war on terror. Our continued military involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan calls for an analysis of what is going on in the intelligence community, putting it into authorization form so it can go on to be discussed and debated on the floor.

It is a matter of life and death. But we are being blocked again from considering a bill that provides the legislative roadmap for America's intelligence programs. America is not meant to work that way. Similar to the bills I have mentioned, you have to get authorization. It is done routinely. It is very puzzling.

Now, there are 16 separate provisions under our 2007 authorization bill—we are in the period for the 2008 authorization bill—enhancing and clarifying the authority of the Director of National Intelligence. These provisions include improvements to the way we approach and manage human intelligence, which the vice chairman and I feel very strongly about, information sharing, and the ability to manage intelligence community resources. Those are words with a great deal behind them.

I, like many of my colleagues, have been increasingly concerned about the seemingly endless stream of leaks of classified information. This bill includes provisions improving the authority of the Director of National Intelligence, whom we put in charge to look at matters such as these, and the

Director of the CIA to protect intelligence sources and methods and a provision to increase the penalties for unauthorized disclosure of the identity of a covert agent.

The bill also contains numerous provisions intended to improve oversight of the intelligence community. We have not been doing that in the sense that we should, and Vice Chairman Bond and I worked very closely together on this issue. He is a ferocious pursuer of intelligence wherever he can find it, and he usually manages to bring it back with him. Section 408 will establish a statutory inspector general for the intelligence community. The DNI, the Director of National Intelligence, has used his power to create an IG, but the power to do so doesn't mean a requirement to do so. So we would strengthen that position in this legislation and make it more accountable to Congress.

Section 434 of the bill strengthens accountability and oversight of the technical intelligence agencies by providing a very important matter: that the heads of the National Security Agency, the National Reconnaissance Office, and the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency are to be appointed by the President, as they have been but with the advice and consent of the Senate. That has not been the case. This is an enormous fountain of intelligence, and we think they ought to be responsive to the two Intelligence Committees in the Senate and the House.

My colleagues may be surprised that the head of an agency with as central a role in the intelligence community as the National Security Agency or an agency with the enormous budget of the National Reconnaissance Office is not appointed with Senate confirmation. It is really shocking. Whether it was an oversight or not, I have no idea, but it is wrong. Senator MIKULSKI pointed this out. This bill would correct that.

Section 108, cosponsored in committee last year by Senators LEVIN and HAGEL, seeks to improve the timely flow of information to congressional intelligence committees. In other words, things can't be put off for a year or 2 years, 6 months or whatever. We try to enforce our view that we are an oversight group and we intend to be treated as such and we will not be treated in a lesser way. Similar language was included in the intelligence reform legislation that passed the Senate in 2004 and in S. 4, which passed the Senate last month.

There are requirements for the provision of specific information, including a report on the implementation of the Detainee Treatment Act and a separate report on the operation of clandestine detention facilities. These are not trivial matters, as the Presiding Officer understands, and they cannot be dealt with trivially by this body, and therefore we need this bill.

These provisions are all intended to improve our ability to make decisions